(3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 511 OF 2002

PETITIONER : Sudhir Kumar Yadav S/o. Late Dhruv Ram Yadav, aged about 23 years, R/o Gandai Pandariya, Dist. Rajnandgaon (CG)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

(1) State of Chhattisgarh Through: Secretary, Forest Department Raipur. (C.G.)

(2) Conservator of Forest & officer, Durg, Circle Durg.

(3) Divisional Forest Officer, general Forest Division Khairagarh.

(4) Divisional Forest Officer, product forest division, Khairagarh.

(5) Collector, Rajnandgaon.

P.R. No. 511/02
Presented by Shri ...
dated ... 05.03.2002 ...

शपथ आयुक्त,
एम. के. शुक्ला
बिलासपुर (म.प्र.)
05/3/02
बिलासपुर तहसील कोर्ट

COPY

(2) (4)

WRIT PETITION U/A 226/227 OF THE CONSITITUTION OF INDIA

(27)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO. 511 OF 2002

Petitioner : Sudhir Kumar Yadav

versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Smt. Indira Tripathi, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Ajay Dwivedi, Panel lawyer for the respondents/State.

ORAL ORDER
(4th May, 2006)

1. The father of the petitioner namely Shri Dhruv Ram Yadav was employed as Guard in the Forest Department at Pangaongarh Forest Range Production Forest Division, District Rajnandgaon. Shri Dhruv Ram Yadav died on 14.4.1999 in harness.

2. The petitioner, being one of the dependent-legal heirs, filed an application for compassionate appointment on 20.10.1999. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the application was rejected on the ground that the appointment of the petitioner's father was not regular. He was appointed on daily wages basis.

3. The Government of Chhattisgarh, by its circular dated 2.2.2006, has directed all the departments to consider cases of all the eligible dependant-legal heir of the employees, who died in harness between 1.11.1997 to 31.10.2000 for compassionate appointment.

4. Accordingly, the Government of Chhattisgarh is directed to consider the case of the petitioner as per its own circular dated 2.2.2006 and also in view of the order dated 20.12.2005 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.1322/2002 and other connected matters on its own merit, in accordance with law, on such representation being filed by the petitioner.

5. For the reasons stated above, the writ petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu